REPORT OF

LAND USE PLANNING CONFERENCES

CENTRAL STATES

Spring Mill Inn, Mitchell, Indiana,
September 23 to 26, 1940

Retlaw Hotel, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin,
September 25 to 27, 1940

United States Department of Agriculture
U.S. Extension Service

1542-40

SUMMARY

An analysis of the discussions at these conferences indicates that experience has tended to clarify many questions. For example:

1. General agreement has been reached concerning desirable representation on committees and methods of obtaining membership.

2. It is recognized that women are interested in land use planning and have a definite contribution to make, particularly in relation to those problems affecting the home and the social institutions of the community.

3. The responsibilities and opportunities of different personnel groups are rapidly being clarified in each State.

4. The planning process should flow smoothly from preliminary organization to coordinated action without conscious break.

Problems that require continued thought and attention include the following:

1. The best methods of following through on recommendations.

2. Continuing local committees in productive activity.

3. The desirability of developing area, State-wide, or even regional policies and programs is becoming more apparent.

4. The broadening scope of land use planning is bringing new problems of relationship with other planning activities. Several States use the terms, "agricultural planning," "rural planning," and "land use planning" interchangeably.

5. There is need for further study of techniques in planning, particularly in relation to counties and areas of very uniform conditions. Care should be exercised not to standardize procedures too soon.

6. There is need for finding methods of accelerating expansion of planning activities to all the counties.

7. There are a number of open questions relating to research that need further consideration.

8. The best methods of developing effective participation by college and other technical workers have not been fully determined. There needs to be further experimenting with this problem.

9. State committees are just beginning to work out their function. Much attention needs to be given to the work of this important element in the planning process.

10. The problem of getting large numbers of local people familiar with and participating in the planning process is ever present and must be recognized for best results.

11. Effective methods of maintaining intimate and active cooperation by all participating groups needs much careful thought.

REPORT OF LAND-USE PLANNING CONFERENCES

Held at
SPRING MILL INN, MITCHELL, INDIANA, SEPTEMBER 23 to 26, 1940
RETLAW HOTEL, FOND DU LAC, WISCONSIN, SEPTEMBER 25 to 27, 1940

These Conferences were attended by State and Federal representatives of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Experiment Station, and the Extension Service. (See list attached.) Similarity of problems discussed and conclusions reached suggest one report for the two conferences.

The purposes of the conferences as stated by Dr. D. A. Fitzgerald at Spring Mill were:

1. To provide an opportunity to exchange experiences and get new ideas.

2. To discuss with the States some forward steps.

3. To examine the planning processes and appraise their effectiveness for developing programs to meet some of the major problems facing American agriculture.

4. To discuss expansion of the work to all counties.

The Department of Agriculture looks to land-use planning as an aid in integrating and improving Federal programs now in operation as well as insuring close cooperation between farm people and those administering such programs. This applies also to developing and to altering agricultural policies and to administering programs when inaugurated. Development of undertakings that local individuals or groups may apply to the solution of their own problems without much outside aid is also expected. A common desire is active widespread farmer responsibility, leadership, and participation in the development of an understanding of problems involved and their possible solutions.

Director H. C. Ramsower of Ohio in presenting the "Viewpoint of One State" emphasized:

1. Land-use planning did not start at Mount Weather, but the Mount Weather Conference made possible crystallization of the feeling that there was need for something that would bring together the many agencies working with farm people - a technique that would correlate, integrate, and bring together programs in various areas.

2. The county and community committee idea came as a result of thinking on possible feasible procedures. This idea was developed as the need for authoritative personnel to think through the problems became apparent.

3. There was need for a channel through which problems known to county, State, and National committees might be channeled to agencies or others empowered to act; to the Secretary of Agriculture, to other administrators.

4. There is use for all available information in the hands of laymen and technical workers.

5. Land use planning calls attention to the existence of local differences and differing objectives. In our discussions we need to keep in mind -

   a. The local viewpoint.

   b. Large national programs.

6. It has led to the recognition of a whole gamut of local economic and social problems.

In discussing objectives at the Fond du Lac conference, Dr. O. B. Jesness, Chief, Division of Agricultural Economics, University of Minnesota, contributed the following viewpoints:

1. Land classification maps are a useful means to an end and not the end product of land use planning.

2. Coordination is desirable and land use planning can aid with this problem, yet this can hardly be its main purpose.

3. A major objective is to develop better understanding on the part of all concerned (including ourselves) of the fundamentals involved. We are interested in developing background understanding for committee members to use in the future in arriving at judgments and decisions on specific proposals.

4. Flexibility and latitude both in methods and objectives are desirable until we learn the possibilities and limitations of land use planning.

5. It is important that freedom of thinking and action on the part of committees be encouraged. We should endeavor to supply them with all possible information so that their thinking and recommendations will be based on fact and their reasoning will be sound.

6. People should be encouraged to approach their problems from the point of view of what they can do about their solutions themselves before referring them to the State or National capitals. Any semblance of a pressure group should be avoided.

7. Land use planning needs to be envisioned as a long-time educational process - of people looking at facts and situations, thinking about them, discussing, arguing, and developing individual, community, and other lines of action to effect improvements. It needs patience, open-mindedness, and vision if it is to serve its real purpose.

The progress of the work in each State and procedures used were reported by members of the Land-Grant College-BAE Committees supplemented by statements from county agricultural and home demonstration agents.

Early in each conference, a committee representating the different groups of workers present was set up to draft a list of the most pressing questions which they felt needed consideration at the conference. The high lights of the discussion of these questions are regrouped and reported under the following headings:

I. Problems of specialized groups in participating effectively in land use planning:

1. Assistance needed from extension supervisors.

a. Supervisors should help in organizing the planning activities in a county. This avoids confusion between land use planning, extension program planning, or other planning activities which may be under way.

b. Supervisors should be informed at all times concerning the progress in the counties so as to be in a position to arrange special assistance when needed, to "iron out" relationship difficulties, and to assist in following recommendations through to action.

c. Each supervisor should attend a sufficient number of local meetings to be familiar with problems of operation and with effective techniques.

d. They should arrange for and attend training school for agents, specialists, and committeemen.

e. They should follow through on any desirable reorganization of extension programs made evident by land use planning work.

2. The contribution of specialists and technicians to land use planning -

a. We must look to the specialist to provide factual materials in a readily usable form relative to problems under consideration. Proper consideration of factual materials available from specialists will help to avoid impractical and unfeasible recommendations.

b. Each should assist in analyzing and appraising problems in his or her particular field and work with committees in developing solutions of these problems.

c. Specialists should attend a sufficient number of local meetings to understand the organization and techniques being used in order that their contributions can be made most effectively.

d. One difficulty mentioned arises from the fact that most specialists are trained in a particular subject-matter field and are not accustomed to considering the farm as a whole.

e. Technicians other than extension specialists can -

1. Assist with training schools for committeemen.

2. Provide committeemen with information available from their respective services.

3. Assist in adjusting the programs of their respective services to the recommendations of land use planning committees.

II. Research and Land Use Planning.

1. Research workers have the responsibility of putting their results in usable and palatable form. This includes reworking old research for new purposes as well as studies of newer problems.

2. Some thought needs to be given to the differences in information needed for individual farm planning and for area planning (service research). BAE is organized to help with these problems. It is necessary to relate service research to specific problems. For example, in Ohio the need was cited for determining how farm people in the hill sections can make a reasonable living from agriculture.

Local demands for this type of research are largely unpredictable. At the present time, much of this type of research being done is on "bootleg time." This adds to the difficulties of developing research programs and adjusting budgets. Revised regulations or even legislation may be needed to permit adequate attention to this research problem.

3. Methods of financing this type of research should be such that we are less dependent on short-time helpers who may not be familiar with local situations.

4. Ohio is developing a technique for describing land use areas in an attempt to be more scientific and objective.

5. Following is a partial list of studies related to land use planning as reported by Iowa:

   a. A State-wide study of farm consolidation.

   b. Study of how well production credit is meeting the need.

   c. Land sale contracts.

   d. The development and use of a soil-management inventory blank.

   e. Population, age distribution, and opportunity for employment. This study was made on 400 quarter-sections using a two-page schedule.

III. Home and social phases of land use planning.

1. "Any problem of people living on the land is a land use problem." There is a joint interest of men and women where the problems of the farm affect the home and the community.

2. The relation of home conditions to land capabilities and current land uses is being studied; also the relation of current land uses to such social services as schools, health, and recreational facilities. Mrs. Blanche W. Clinton, home demonstration agent, St. Charles County, Missouri, suggests a general survey rather than special studies as the first approach.

3. It is difficult to recognize social problems at the beginning of land use changes. Lack of research in home and social problems is a handicap.

4. Fitting living standards to income situations is a real problem.

5. Social problems are brought out in discussions at community or neighborhood meetings, seldom at county meetings.

6. Miss Mary A. Gordon, Home Demonstration Agent in Darke County, Ohio, reported that in her county equal numbers of men and women were selected on community committees. They first meet together in the homes to clarify the objectives of that particular meeting, then separate; the men meeting in the living-room and the women in the kitchen or vice versa. The land was classified by the men, while the women studied and made surveys of home problems. At the second meeting, the men's map was used to locate the homes surveyed. At the third meeting, the farm family food supply was studied. Recommendations were prepared at the fourth meeting.

IV. How may we obtain wider local understanding of problems and of the recommendations of county land use planning committees? The farmer must have an appreciation of what planning means on his own farm as well as of its broader aspects, if his interest and cooperation are to be maintained.

1. Wide use of community and neighborhood committees is basic. This will create interest which will precede and later assist in obtaining wide understanding. Freedom of action of committees is important and should be encouraged.

2. Preparatory study groups made up of a highly selective group of leaders is a good approach and has been used effectively.

3. Luncheons and tours for editors, agency representatives, farmers, and special groups were suggested.

4. Provide opportunity for farmers to register reactions to tentative proposals. Meetings with opportunity for discussion are desirable.

5. Reliance upon newspaper publicity alone will not accomplish the end desired, and ill-advised or premature news stories may be even detrimental.

6. It is important that agencies understand proposals and are sympathetic thereto before publicity is given to recommendations affecting their respective programs.

V. How fast should we move in the direction of unified programs?

1. The development of a unified county program is an evolutionary process. It is desirable to avoid definite breaks between analysis, recommendations, and action getting. The progress of all phases should be simultaneous but not necessarily at the same rate. One problem may be in active solution stage while another is just being clarified by analysis and study of the situations.

2. There is danger of a let-down following recommendations if some moves are not immediately made toward definite action. As an example of one type of follow-up, Ross County, Ohio -

   a. Sent selected list of 75 major problems to 14 agencies with requests for suggestions on what each agency could do. The answers showed overlapping fields of interest and viewpoints which provided opportunity for discussion and clarification of their respective fields and programs, and possible ways of coordinating activities.

   b. Set up a calendar of activities for all agencies.

3. A unified program can develop only as fast as all concerned are ready to move. County Agent N. S. Hadley of Parke County, Indiana, reported that progress depends upon:

   a. The ability and endurance of the county agricultural agent, the home demonstration agent, and assistant agents.

   b. The interest of the people in the community and their willingness to take over necessary "chores."

   c. The strength of the convictions of the county committee that their proposals are worth while.

   d. A cooperative attitude on the part of all the professional people concerned.

In order to speed up understanding of the cooperative features of land use planning, several States conducted a series of district conferences of county and district personnel of the service agencies. These conferences helped clarify and promote better understanding of the relationship of each agency to the planning process.

VI. The functions and problems in connection with the work of the State Land Use Committee:

1. The State committee should perform for the State those planning functions which the county committee performs for the county.

2. The extension director as chairman of the State Land Use Planning Committee and as a member of various advisory committees has a great responsibility and a great opportunity. As thinking turns to district or State plans, there is opportunity to direct a statesman-like attitude toward those problems which the State can do something about but which the counties cannot.

3. The future importance of the State committee will depend upon the manner in which it functions in handling problems referred from the counties in further developing agricultural policies for the State and areas within the State and in its relationships with existing national and regional programs.

4. The participation of agency representatives is of major importance. They are a definite part of the planning processes. Each has a definite important contribution to make. It will help if recommendations are so written that they do not imply undue criticism of past actions.

5. It is possible to obtain only a limited amount of the time of farmer members. Appointment of special subcommittees will help conserve their time. The subcommittees appointed should be on a problem basis.

VII. The functions of the Land-Grant College-BAE Committee.

1. To facilitate the activities of the State Land Use Planning Committee. The members act as a technical committee on all phases of land use planning. Their responsibility as a committee is to the State committee, and as such they have no administrative duties.

2. They develop procedures for county planning activities and suggest organization, calendars, and committee work.

3. They cooperate with county agent supervisors in recommending counties for expansion and in planning the county planning activities.

4. They examine requests for research, recommend needed research, and suggest priorities.

5. They analyze special problems.

6. They analyze the recommendations of county committees for the use of the State committee.

VIII. How can county agents maintain local support while using so much of their time in rendering indirect service? As County Agent Fred Keeler of Ross County, Ohio, stated, "A unified program is like a snowball rolling downhill. It requires increasingly greater help from the county extension office. It is embarrassing not to be able to render assistance on problems presented because of lack of time."

1. Agents may emphasize importance of educational phases of the many programs.

2. As coordinated programs develop, less time is required for organization and educational opportunities increase.

3. Recognition of local problems also increases the demand for educational work.

4. The possibilities of increasing efficiency through local leader training and other methods have not been exhausted. Planning should lead to more effective use of agent's time.

5. It should be kept in mind that the committee and not the agent is the coordinating agency. The committees should be utilized for this purpose to the fullest extent.

IX. How can the United States Department of Agriculture render greater assistance in land use planning?

1. The recent series of pamphlets helped inform committeemen. This type of service should be continued and expanded.

There is need for assistance in broadening the viewpoint of the farmer.

2. Keep State people informed of procedures being used in other States.

3. Report back to States new action resulting from recommendations.

Dr. M. L. Wilson discussed problems of agriculture and the national defense with special reference to nutrition. He emphasized the following points:

1. All nations now at war have developed food and nutrition programs. Both the British and the Germans are stressing Vitamin B in the diet.

2. From 40 to 45 percent of the United States population is undernourished according to biologically accepted standards for best performance of body and nerves.

3. There is some talk of a National Nutrition Committee. Many new developments in nutrition have appeared during the last 3 years and many more are about to be released. Dr. Stiebeling will release results of W. P. A. study soon.

4. Regardless of attitude of national defense on nutrition, we are expected to give it our best support. A county study of the nutritional situation was suggested to be followed by a program providing for:

   a. Self production.

   b. Cooperation with W. P. A.

   c. School lunches.

   d. Food Stamp Plan and surplus disposal.

5. National defense may suggest the following types of research:

   a. Experiment station evaluate diets of States by studying types of income levels, types of farming, size of town, etc.

   b. Food habits. How do they change?

   c. How may we motivate greater use of gardens?

SPRING MILL INN, MITCHELL, INDIANA
September 23 to 26, 1940

Name	Agency	State
H. P. Rusk	Director of Extension	Illinois
J. C. Spitler	Assistant Director of Extension	Illinois
Mrs. K. VanAken Burns	State Home Demonstration Leader	Illinois
F. J. Keilholz	Extension Editor	Illinois
F. E. Longmire	District Extension Leader	Illinois
J. D. Bilsborrow	District Extension Leader	Illinois
W. L. Burlison	Department of Agronomy	Illinois
J. B. Andrews	Land Use Planning Leader	Illinois
V. B. Fielder	State BAE Representative	Illinois
H. J. Reed	Dean, College of Agriculture	Indiana
T. A. Coleman	Associate Director of Extension	Indiana
G. D. Scarseth	Soils Chemist	Indiana
L. E. Hoffman	Associate County Agent Leader	Indiana
Lella R. Gaddis	State Home Demonstration Leader	Indiana
Charlotte Etter	Parke County Home Demonstration Agent	Indiana
N. S. Hadley	Parke County Agricultural Agent	Indiana
J. B. Kohlmeyer	State BAE Representative	Indiana
Arthur Mauch	Assistant State BAE Representative	Indiana
J. Carroll Bottum	Land Use Planning Leader	Indiana
F. H. Demaree	Land Use Planning Specialist	Indiana
A. M. Nichter	Land Use Planning Specialist	Indiana
R. K. Bliss	Director of Extension	Iowa
Sara Porter Ellis	State Home Demonstration Leader	Iowa
J. W. Merrill	District Extension Leader	Iowa
L. T. Nutty	District Extension Leader	Iowa
Roland Welborn	Extension Agricultural Economics	Iowa
Fanny Gannon	Home Management Specialist	Iowa
W. W. Wilcox	Experiment Station	Iowa
R. K. Buck	Experiment Station	Iowa
Joe Reed	State BAE Representative	Iowa
Herbert G. Folken	Assistant State BAE Representative	Iowa
E. F. Graff	Land Use Planning Leader	Iowa
F. A. Kutish	Land Use Planning Assistant	Iowa
James Vermur	Land Use Planning Assistant	Iowa
J. W. Burch	Director of Extension	Missouri
O. R. Johnson	Department of Agricultural Economics	Missouri
Rachel Markwell	State Extension Agent	Missouri
Rena R. Jenkins	State Extension Agent	Missouri
R. B. Baker	State Extension Agent	Missouri
F. E. Rogers	State Extension Agent	Missouri
C. C. Hearne	State Extension Agent	Missouri

Name	Agency	State
Parker Rodgers	State Extension Agent	Missouri
John Falloon	Administrative Assistant	Missouri
Mrs. Blanche W. Clinton	St. Charles County Home Demonstration Agent	Missouri
Ross J. Silkett	State BAE Representative	Missouri
A. H. Mussman	Assistant BAE Representative	Missouri
J. D. Monin, Jr.	Land Use Planning Leader	Missouri
Raymond F. Smith	Land Use Planning Assistant	Missouri
R. Hargrave	Land Use Planning Assistant	Missouri
J. J. Cowan	Land Use Planning Assistant	Missouri
Norman Clizer	Land Use Planning Assistant	Missouri
H. C. Ramsower	Director of Extension	Ohio
Edmund Secrest	Director of Experiment Station	Ohio
J. J. Falconer	Rural Economics	Ohio
J. E. McClintock	Extension Editor	Ohio
Guy Dowdy	Land Use Planning Leader	Ohio
Minnie Price	Home Demonstration Leader	Ohio
Nellie Watts	Assistant Home Demonstration Leader	Ohio
Dorothy S. Hammans	Assistant Home Demonstration Leader	Ohio
Mary A. Gordon	Darke County Home Demonstration Agent	Ohio
F. R. Keeler	Ross County Agricultural Agent	Ohio
Guy W. Miller	Rural Economics	Ohio
M. L. Fredmore	BAE Representative	Ohio
L. H. Rhodes	BAE Flood Control	Ohio
G. E. Young	BAE Regional Representative	Milwaukee, Wisc.
Ed Losey	BAE Regional Office	Milwaukee, Wisc.
James H. Marshall	BAE Regional Office	Milwaukee, Wisc.
George T. Schaefer	BAE	Milwaukee, Wisc.
M. L. Wilson	Director of Extension Work	Washington, D.C.
Grace E. Frysinger	Extension Service	Washington, D.C.
Karl Knaus	Extension Service	Washington, D.C.
Paul V. Kepner	Extension Service	Washington, D.C.
Dennis A. Fitzgerald	BAE	Washington, D.C.
R. L. Cochran	BAE	Washington, D.C.
L. L. Scranton	BAE	Washington, D.C.
Bert Johnson	BAE	Washington, D.C.
Wm. F. Watkins	BAE	Washington, D.C.
C. W. Crickman	BAE	Washington, D.C.
John Blackmore	BAE	Washington, D.C
Jas. L. Robinson	Farm Credit Administration	Washington, D.C.

RETLAW HOTEL, FOND DU LAC, WISCONSIN
September 25 to 27, 1940

Name	Agency	State
R. J. Baldwin	Director of Extension	Michigan
Edna V. Smith	State Home Demonstration Leader	Michigan
C. V. Ballard	County Agent Leader	Michigan
J. G. Wells, Jr.	Assistant County Agent Leader	Michigan
Paul M. Barrett	BAE Representative	Michigan
Louis S. Drake	Assistant BAE Representative	Michigan
H. A. Berg	Land Use Planning Specialist	Michigan
Paul E. Miller	Director of Extension	Minnesota
C. H. Bailey	Vice Director, Experiment Station	Minnesota
O. B. Jesness	Division of Agricultural Economics	Minnesota
Julia O. Newton	State Home Demonstration Leader	Minnesota
Mildred Sailor	Assistant State Home Demonstration Leader	Minnesota
R. M. Douglass	District Extension Leader	Minnesota
A. E. Engebretson	District Extension Leader	Minnesota
C. L. McNelly	District Extension Leader	Minnesota
Esther P. McKowen	Winona County Home Demonstration Agent	Minnesota
H. C. Pederson	Winona County Agricultural Agent	Minnesota
Wm. A. Peters	Extension Specialist, Agricultural Conservation	Minnesota
S. H. Rutford	Land Use Planning Leader	Minnesota
H. P. Hanson	Land Use Planning Specialist	Minnesota
A. D. Wilson	Land Use Planning Specialist	Minnesota
Roy M. Gilcreast	BAE Representative	Minnesota
W. W. Clark	Associate Director of Extension	Wisconsin
Arlie Mucks	Assistant Extension Director	Wisconsin
Noble Clark	Assistant Director, Experiment Station	Wisconsin
Andy Hopkins	Extension Editor	Wisconsin
Blanche L. Lee	State Home Demonstration Leader	Wisconsin
Josephine Pollock	Assistant State Home Demonstration Leader	Wisconsin
B. F. Busy	District Extension Leader	Wisconsin
W. A. Rowlands	District Extension Leader	Wisconsin
E. A. Jorgensen	District Extension Leader	Wisconsin
R. B. Pallett	District Extension Leader	Wisconsin
Geo. L. Wright	Ashland County, Agricultural Agent	Wisconsin
Helen Muehlmeier	Washington County Home Demonstration Agent	Wisconsin
E. E. Skaliskey	Washington County Agricultural Agent	Wisconsin

Name	Agency	State
L. G. Gordon	State BAE Representative	Wisconsin
Don S. Anderson	Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin	Wisconsin
A. F. Wileden	Rural Sociologist	Wisconsin
G. E. Young	Regional BAE Representative	Wisconsin
J. H. Marshall	BAE Regional Office	Wisconsin
F. H. Forsyth	BAE, Farm Population, Regional Office	Wisconsin
M. L. Wilson	Director of Extension Work	Washington, D.C.
Grace E. Frysinger	Extension Service	Washington, D.C.
Karl Knaus	Extension Service	Washington, D.C.
Paul V. Kepner	Extension Service	Washington, D.C.
Bushrod Allin	BAE	Washington, D.C.
R. L. Cochran	BAE	Washington, D.C.
L. L. Scranton	BAE	Washington, D.C.
K. J. Nicholson	BAE	Washington, D.C.
E. A. Foster	BAE	Washington, D.C.
George T. Hudson	Farm Credit Administration	Washington, D.C.